AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. I.—MAY, 1889.—NO. 5.

THE BLOW IN CONFIRMATION.

AFTER having been anointed with the holy chrism, the newly confirmed Christian receives from the bishop a gentle blow upon the cheek. The Rubric says: "*Deinde leviter cum in maxilla cædit, dicens: Pax tecum.*" Liturgical writers for the most part agree upon the symbolical meaning of this act. The young soldier of Christ takes upon himself at length the responsibilities of the spiritual warfare to which he is called. He will defend his faith, and is prepared to sustain with valiant courage all the hardships which must needs be the portion of every man in the Church militant. This also is the explicit interpretation which the catechism of the Council of Trent[1] gives to the ceremony.

But we know that this ceremony does not belong to the essential parts of the sacrament of confirmation. Like many other rites of the Church it was introduced—not indeed to add to the doctrine committed to her by the Apostles, but—to explain and impress upon the rude and unlettered minds of the newly converted races, by visible signs, that invisible grace which they could not otherwise have understood or remem-

[1] Catech. Rom. de Confirm. xx.

bered. Accordingly we are not surprised to find that the above ceremony was apparently not in use before the thirteenth century.[1] Nor is it used at this day in the oriental Church. The abbé Tougard, in an interesting paper upon the subject,[2] brings out some novel suggestions as to the probable motive which determined the introduction of the ceremony in the rite of confirmation. According to his explanation, it was originally simply intended to impress upon the candidate's memory the fact of the reception of this sacrament, and held, in part at least, the place of a certificate. To some, this interpretation might, at first sight, appear irreverent, but the abbé not only shows that such manner of attesting serious and solemn acts generally prevailed in those times, but he quotes the express opinion of Jean Le Veneur[3] for this custom at confirmation. "A blow," says the latter, "is given to the children when they are confirmed, in order to keep alive their remembrance of the fact, lest forgetfulness of having received this grace might cause them to approach a second time to receive this sacrament." We would naturally infer, with the abbé, that the blow was not given as gently as the Ritual of the present has it. But whatever be the value of Le Veneur's testimony, coming to us, as it does, from the sixteenth

[1] Martene says: Postquam episcopus formam pronunciavit, percutit leniter confirmati maxillam : *Cujus ritus nullam apud veteres scriptores aut Rituales mentionem vidi, nec ullum Durando, Mimatensi Episcopo antiquiorem*, qui de illo loqueretur, auctorem reperi. Sed statuta synodalia Johannis Episcopi Leodiensis, c. iii., n. 2, statuunt ut parentes confirmatis sæpe reducant ad memoriam quando, et a quo, et ubi fuerunt confirmati. (De Antiquibus Eccles. ritibus. Ed. Martene, vol. I., l. i., c. i., art. 3, 13. Venet. 1783).

The Durandus referred to is "Guilielmus Durantes, dictus speculator, natione Vasco, Episcopus Nimarensis" (Mimatensis), "vivebat tempore Nicolai III Pont. A. D. 1280." (Vid. Bellarm. de script. sacr.) Johannes episcopus Leodiensis (Leodicensis) belongs to the same century.

[2] De l'origine du soufflet que l'evêque donne à la confirmation. L'abbé A. Tougard, Docteur, Prof. hon. au petit Semin. de Rouen.—Extrait de la Revue *Précis Historique*, Jan. 1888.

[3] Cardinal Johannes le Veneur, bishop of Lisieux, who died in 1543. (Series Episcop. Eccl. Cath.—P. B. Gams).

century, it is quite certain that this manner of securing a souvenir was in use among the Franks, and dates back as far, at least, as the middle of the sixth century. "In important sales, when no contract had been made, the purchaser took with him twelve witnesses with as many children; and after the price had been paid and possession obtained, he [the buyer] had to give blows to each of the children and pull their ears, in order that later on they might bear testimony to the transaction." (Capitularia Regg. Francor. I. 44. Ed. 1677.) That in these cases a proper regard was had to the quality of the witness, is evident from another citation, which Mabillon refers to the year 1034. At the foundation of the Abbey of Preaux, in the diocese of Lisieux, "William received from his father a blow, that he might remember it [the foundation]. Richard of Lillebonne received another, and when he asked why Onfroy had dealt him so hard a blow (gratifié d'un soufflet si terrible—permaximum) he received answer: Because you are so much younger than I, and you may live perhaps a long time, and attest this act, if circumstances should require it. Hugo, count of Galeran, received a blow in the third place. The abbé Tougard quotes another passage from Du Cange to the same effect,[1] and concludes, as we said above, by expressing the conviction that this practice, originally used by the laity for the purpose of attesting contracts and other important affairs, was, from the time of St. Louis, gradually adopted by the episcopate, and whilst the act was retained, it lost its original significance in course of time, when written certificates took the place of other modes of recording the sacred act. He traces this gradual change in the terms in which the later theologians speak of the ceremony. Suarez, whilst holding to the symbolic meaning of the act, nevertheless adds: Alii dicunt fieri etiam ob memoriam

[1] Du Cange gives similar instances in several places of his glossary, and adds his own opinion: Credo id actum aut agi solitum, ut testes postmodum, cum in rei gestæ testimonium advocarentur, in memoriam revocarent, se eo loco alapis cæsos aut auribus vellicatos. (Gloss. "Alapa," Edit. Osmont, 1733).

(Quæst. 73, 12, vol. xx., 694, ed. Vives). Bonacina and Layman mention both. Benedict XIV., who refers to Martene's quotation, given above, adds that according to the council of Sens, 1524, the blow was intended to recall to the minds of the children the fact that they had been confirmed, lest they approach a second time; but, continues the Pontiff, there is a much higher reason assigned by the Roman catechism.

We have no difficulty in admitting the facts of the abbé Tougard, but his inference, however ingenious it is, presents some difficulties. Leaving aside the interpretation of the council of Sens, which is identical in point of time with that cited from the bishop of Lisieux, namely, three centuries after the supposed introduction of the ceremony—little remains of a positive character by which to connect the latter in its origin with the secular custom referred to. The significance of the blow when first introduced lay, as the author himself suggests, in being administered with some force.[1] But it will be remembered that in the Rubric of the Pontifical the word *leviter* occurs, which, to judge from Martene's citation, is as old as the custom of administering the blow itself. There is also an apparent incongruity between the abbé's interpretation of the act and the form which accompanies it, *Pax tecum*, which latter seems also to have been part of the ceremony from the beginning. We know, moreover, that the blow, as part of a public ceremonial, had various significations among our ancestors. Thus the Romans used it in the manumission of slaves; the Saxons, on the contrary, to fix publicly the stigma of serfdom.[2] As a witness act among the Franks, it was generally accompanied by pulling of the ears, and given to the party attesting, which, in the present case, would be the Sponsor.

[1] C'est qu' alors le soufflet enminiature des temps modernes dut s'administrer avec une vigueur propre a laisser dans le confirmé une impression durable." (De l'origine etc., cit.)

[2] "Per alapum seu colaphum servum facere." (Specul. Saxon., lib. iii., art. 32, 5 apud Du Cange "Transcornati.")

However, whilst looking over the authorities to which our ingenious author refers, we could not prevent the conviction forcing itself upon our mind that the blow given in confirmation has a close connection with that given to the soldier when he is being knighted according to the ceremonial of the Church. It is true that the latter rite itself may be traceable to the Frankish custom [1] of attesting serious transactions, and have served as a reminder of some kind, apart from its symbolic character, but it would still make a considerable difference whether the blow given in confirmation derives its origin directly from the barbarous manner of keeping the memory alive, or from the sacred character of Christian knighthood, wherein the new soldier was reminded that a man's task awaited him. Let us give some reasons in favor of the latter assumption.

In the first place, we must remember the similarity of the special vocation, if it may be so called, in which both the new soldier and the newly confirmed are initiated. They receive the title, the mark, the weapon of the Christian militia. In confirmation, the bishop gives to us: "Signum frontis et sacri titulum bellatoris, ut signati chrismate sancto signiferi esse mereamur cœlestes." The medieval writers use almost everywhere the same terms in speaking of the vocation and character of the soldier and the duty of the newly confirmed.

The terms *sacramentum*, *character*, *imperator*, are used in speaking of both, though, of course, with a difference of meaning. "Milites" says St. Thomas, [2] "charactere insigniuntur quasi ad militiam deputati." That similar language is used with regard to confirmation, it is needless to say. As the con-

[1] The abbé Tougard himself cites the learned Eckhart for this opinion: "The same custom has introduced the usage of giving a blow to those who receive the right of carrying a sword, *that they might remember that now they are men.*"—D. Bouquet, Hist. de France, iv., 247, not. a.

But Du Cange thinks that the blow given to the knight was derived from the manumission of slaves. "Quos enim manumittebant eos alapa circumagebant." He quotes various authorities for this.—Gloss. loc. cit.

[2] St. Thom. III$_a$ qu. 63, 3, c.

firmed so the soldier renewed his allegiance to his Lord, which was called "sacramentum." "Militaribus eum in virum perfectum dedicavit sacramentis," says Lambert Ardensis.[1] Notice also that, as the rank of knighthood was called the perfection of manhood, so confirmation in the language of theology is called the perfection of Baptism. "Imperfectum, *nec omnibus suis armis instructum militaturum Christianum* majores nostri judicarunt eum, quem non corroborasset Confirmationis Sacramentum." Knighthood was conferred by princes and lords, and in regard to confirmation Cardinal Bellarmin draws an argument of analogy from the princely rank of Bishops, to prove that the administration of this sacrament belongs by right to the latter: "In Confirmatione adscribimur ad Christi militiam. Adscribere autem ad militiam proprium est Ducum et Imperatorum."[2]

Looking at the rite by which this military character in both cases was conferred, we find an equally striking similarity of form. We have already referred to the fact that the Bishop, in giving the blow upon the cheek, says: Pax tecum. Speaking of knighting as a Christian ceremonial, Martene says:[3] "Insigniens illum charactere militari, dat illi *osculum pacis*, dicens: Esto miles *pacificus*, strenuus, fidelis, et Deo devotus. Et mox *dat sibi* (*illi*) *alapam leviter, dicens:* Exciteris a somno malitiæ et vigila in fide Christi et fama laudabili.' Whether this alapa levis was given with the sword or with the hand, he does not say. But the Roman Pontifical throws light upon the question. In the ceremony for blessing a new soldier, it first states that the Bishop strikes the knight three light blows with the sword upon the shoulder. Then the latter puts the sword back into its sheath, and the Rubric continues: "Pontifex *manu dextera* dat novo militi leviter alapam, dicens: Exciteris a somno, etc., using the exact words given by Martene. It might be asked, but does he strike the cheek or the shoulders with his hand? We have never seen this ceremony, which is

[1] Vid. Du Cange, loc. cit.
[2] Bellarm., Lib. ii., c. 12 med.
[3] Concil. Rotomag., 1581. De Confirm. 1.
[4] De Antiq. Eccl. Rit., Vol. ii., 240.

probably not in use in our day. Still, it might be inferred that the cheek and not the back or shoulders are struck, first, from the fact that in the previous ceremony, where the sword is used, the shoulders are expressly mentioned; next, the word *alapa* means rather a blow *in the face* than upon the neck, for which latter we have the unchanged greek term *colaphus*.[1] It seems strange that Du Cange should charge Duchesne with error when the latter states that the stroke was given with the hand, not with the sword,[2] for, unless Du Cange wishes his criticism to apply simply to the bestowal of knighthood by secular princes, he offers enough testimony in his own pages to prove Duchesne right.

There is not the least doubt that the order of knighthood, even from the earliest days of its institution, was conferred not only by sovereigns and princes, but as frequently by bishops and abbots. It was looked upon as in every sense a sacred ceremony and required a preparation in many ways analogous to that made for the reception of the sacrament of confirmation or of sacred orders. Ablutions, fasting, confession, and holy Communion, and generally vigils or night-watches in the Church on the eve, was part of the ritual for the blessing of a new soldier. Martene, indeed, tells us that he could find no mention of this blessing before the time of Durandus in the old rituals, of which he had examined a great number. But he admits that there is evidence of its having been used by the bishops of the Church at least five hundred years before his own time. He published his work "De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus" in 1699, which would carry the date of the pontifical ceremony of knighting, in which the *alapa levis* was used, back

1 "Alapa est faciei percussio, sicut colaphus colli."
"Dic alapam malæ, colli colaphumque."
(Ebrard. Beth. apud Du Cange: "Alapa.")

2 After citing a number of authorities, according to whom the *alapa militaris* was given with the sword, he says: Ex quibus et hic laudatis scriptionibus satis colligitur, errasse Duchesn. in notis ad Alanum Chart. et lib. 2 Hist. Guin. c. 6, qui putavit ejusmodi alapas militares manu, non gladio, in collum tyronis impactas. (Gloss. Du Cange, loc. cit.)

to the end of the twelfth century.[1] It will be remembered that according to the abbé Tougard the *alapa* given in Confirmation (and which, as Martene says, was given *leniter*) is likely to have originated in the time of St. Louis, that is, in the following century. If the *alapa* of knighthood is, as the learned Eckhart suggests, traceable to the Frankish custom of witnessing, it had evidently lost a good deal of its original significance already in the twelfth century; much more so, we might suppose, would this be the case in the succeeding age, when the manners of the East, introduced by the Crusaders, had joined with Christianity in softening the tone of civilization throughout central Europe. It would be odd, to say the least, if at this time the Church should have adopted a custom whose meaning was so far behind the spirit which she herself was doing most to foster.

If, on the other hand, we call to mind that the age of St. Louis was the age of chivalry, that the one thought which for more than a century had pervaded, almost dominated, society of every rank in Europe, was the defence of the faith, the

[1] Obtinebat tamen jam ante annos 500 militum ab episcopis benedictio; id quod probat Willelmi Cardinalis epistola apud Chesnium (Hist. Franc. tom. iv. p. 765) ad quemdam amicum suum ita scribentis: Ceterum nepotem tuum, de quo affectuosissime rogasti, homini honesto et religioso, episcopo de Salisb. tradidimus, quatenus usque ad festum S. Mariæ, ipsum militari cingulo honoret.—Sed et Petrus monachus Valis Sarnaii in Hist. Allig. cap. 70 narrat quomodo Amalricus, filius Simonis comitis Montis fortis factus fuerit miles in die Nativ. B. Joannis Baptistæ. (Adstante, inquit, episcopo, etc.)—Quo vero ritu novi apud Anglos milites initiarentur ita describit Ingulfus, abbas Crulandensis: Anglorum erat consuetudo, quod qui militiæ legitimæ consecrandus esset, vespere præcedenti diem consecrationis suæ, ad episcopum, vel abbatum, vel monachum, vel sacerdotem aliquem contritus et compunctus, de omnibus peccatis suis confessionem faceret, et absolutus, orationibus et devotionibus et afflictionibus deditus in ecclesia pernoctaret, in crastino quoque missam auditurus gladium super altare offerret, etc.—

Ex Ms. Pontificali Guilielmi Durandi:

"Ense igitur acto, miles novos illum de vagina educit, et evaginatum ter in manu vibrat. Et eo super brachio terso, mox in *vaginam reponit. Quo facto, insigniens illum charactere militari, dat illi osculum pacis*, dicens: Esto miles pacificus . . . *et mox dat sibi* [*illi*] *alapam leniter*, dicens: Exciteris a somno malitiæ, etc.

(Martene De Antiq. Eccl. Rit. Lib. ii. c 12.)

rescuing of the Holy Places from the mussulman; if we recall the fact that the Church nourished this spirit until it converted every man into a soldier of Christ, so that a false zeal at times misled Christians to persecute even the Jew or infidel at home; if we remember how pontiff and priest and religious everywhere instilled this same burning zeal for the defence of Christendom into the young as well as the old, of which the various attempts at Children's Crusades are ample proof—then it may not seem so strange or difficult to explain that the Church should have adopted this rite, whether intentionally or by that natural instinct which loves to teach and animate her children to action. Would it not make the young soldier of Christ more conscious of the fact that he was pledging himself to a duty which some day might require him to bear other arms than mere spiritual weapons, to sustain physical hardships in the Christian camp, aside of temptations against his faith? Would not the child feel some of that dignity of which it really became possessed in the Sacrament of Confirmation, if it received, as it were, the blow of Christian Knighthood, so well expressed in the form of this sacrament, from the same anointed hand which thus touched its elder brothers; with the same kiss of peace; with the same object, namely, to be aroused from the sleep of malice, to be no longer, as hitherto, a soldier in feudal service, fond of bloodshed and rapine, but a "miles pacificus," a soldier whose badge meant the defence of Christ and Christian interests, whose password would be "Pax tecum"?

We did not, in expressing our opinion as to the origin of the blow given in confirmation, wish so much to controvert the abbé Tougard's theory, as rather to draw it out to what seemed to us its legitimate conclusion. Much that is new might probably still be said on the subject. In any case, the *alapa* given to the new soldier, and that given to the newly confirmed, are likely to have some connection with the act of witnessing and remembering among the Franks. But even then we could not argue that the Church, in adopting the

practice, had not a motive distinct from that meaning and suggested by other circumstances. And if so, then the *alapa* was probably always what it still is, a *lenis percussio maxillæ*.

INSTRUCTION OF CONVERTS.

I.

TO feed and guard his own flock is a pastor's first care. Unjust were he and vainly beating the air, who, neglecting the faithful people entrusted to him, made it his chief anxiety with fair words to draw the incredulous multitude outside, in the hope of lessening their prejudice, or by controversy and learned demonstration to win influential converts. No voice will ever be strong or eloquent enough to drown in the ears of God the silent complaint of the children of the household, of whom it could be said: "petierunt panem et non erat qui frangeret eis." Nevertheless, he who zealously guards his own cannot but be animated by a quick charity in behalf of those souls who, purchased by the Precious Blood and destined to immortal life, sit "in the shadow of death." "Adveniat regnum tuum!" daily and hourly repeated, what else can it be to the true priest but a standing admonition both in his public teaching and in his private intercourse to neglect no opportunity of winning souls and directing them to the one true Church of Christ. Faithfully instructing his own people, he will also impart the knowledge of that incomparable faith of which he has the key to non-Catholics, remembering the summing up of the divine steward: "Hæc oportuit facere et illa non omittere" (Matt. xxiii. 23).

It will be easy to accomplish this double task, if we adhere to the rule laid down in the Council of Trent: "Diebus saltem dominicis et festis solemnibus, plebes sibi commissas pro sua et earum capacitate pascant salutaribus verbis, docendo ea, quæ scire omnibus necessarium est ad salutem, annun-

ciandoque eis, cum brevitate et facilitate sermonis, vitia quæ eos declinare, et virtutes quas sectari oporteat, ut pœnam æternam evadere et cœlestem gloriam consequi valeant (Conc. Trid., Sess. V. de Ref., cap. 2). For as it is the instinct of stray sheep to follow any leader, even of their own kind, so the wandering children outside the fold will frequently be led on by the well instructed Catholic who for a certainty knows the way to pasture land. And the shepherd's voice, bespeaking in its very tones the principle, "Love the erring whilst you combat their error," will in his personal intercourse with the stranger do as much in the way of convincing him by a tolerant and kindly spirit as does the acutest reasoning with the greater number of those who are rather indifferent than ignorant, rather prejudiced in heart than in mind. No one will confound such attitude with that false liberalism, which appears to excuse skepticism, depreciate absolute and objective truth, and put divine institution on a level with human invention and usurpation.

II.

But in our practical dealing with those who, having in some way been attracted, present themselves for instruction, much discrimination is required. Our human tendencies are so commingled with our aspirations towards higher and heavenly things, that an infinite variety of motives presents itself in those who seek truth or imagine they do so. About such as are evidently sincere and intelligent, there can be no question as to how we are to receive or treat them. Even when they lack, as is often the case, that strength of purpose which would make them brave human respect or set wholly aside earthly interests, all of which makes them appear small in the eyes of those who have the examples of heroic sacrifices for the faith constantly before them, our judgment must give way to the charity of Christ. Was it a noble trait, and worthy of a prince of the synagogue like Nicodemus, to conceal his visits to Our Lord in the darkness of night? Was

there anything like a pure supernatural motive in the request of the Samaritan woman, "Sir, give me this water, that I may not thirst, nor come hither to draw"? (Luke, iv. 15.) Yet we know how the weary Shepherd forgot both sleep and thirst in His loving zeal to instruct both these erring souls.

There are, however, among the applicants for instruction in the Catholic faith persons whose motives are entirely questionable. Marriage with a Catholic, a lucrative position, hopes of advancement, social reasons manifold, and sometimes a wretched vanity of the quality of the "prig," these and the like are the incentives which occasionally bring non-Catholics to seek the advice of a priest in the matter of choosing a religion. We read and see much of the simplicity and good nature of the proverbial parish priest, whom tramp and truant are alike successful in deceiving; but there are few priests in the active ministry who have not sounded the human heart deep enough to discover at a glance the ground of their candidate for conversion. To a sensitive man the poor disguise of a deception which attempts to make of him a jobber apt to mend or settle doubtful fortunes, and that by so sacred a means as religion, is likely to provoke indignation. But if he be a wise man as well as a shrewd discerner of fraud, if he knows the value of his own power, he will begin to use it to advantage by bearing the folly, serious though it be, of his visitor, and then in the most gradual way unfold it to him. There is nothing that so readily draws a man away from his wilful error, as the consciousness that he has been found out, and that he who has found him out is not only not disposed to take advantage of his knowledge, but has a veil ready to cover it from the possible sneer and taunt of others. Having thus created a disposition to be heard, it would take a very corrupt heart to withstand the truths of our holy faith, the more so as their acceptance is rendered agreeable by the prospect which first led to the desire of having at least the name of a Catholic. Our trifler may become a real good convert. Some of the sweetest hymns of the age of minne-

singers are from the lips and converted heart of a troubadour who went in wanton curiosity to hear the "mad Assisian" preach. St. Francis caught the hunter in his very sport, and successfully tamed him to pursue his own game. At times we may be disposed to send away such people, even if we have no mind to treat them as impostors. Some other priests, the religious next door, have more time and facilities for such work, and we are not quite clear about our duty towards people who do not belong to the faithful residing in our parish. Now, whether our proposed convert is sincere or not, this sort of putting him off has ordinarily a bad effect. Before, the barrier, if there was any, came from themselves, and we could probably have removed it. Now it comes from us, from the representatives of that faith which, in one way or other, presented to them a point of attraction. A kind word might have changed wrong motives and removed false notions about religion. One such opportunity, at least, is lost. If, being evil-minded, they wish to gain their point, they will go elsewhere, but with the added caution of increasing their duplicity. If they are indifferent, the putting off can only serve to discourage them, for how do they know what reception will meet them next door. And if ill humor assert itself, it may happen that, as in the case of a mixed marriage-engagement, the Catholic party is drawn away from the faith.

III.

Having rectified the motive and secured the convert's good will, how shall we proceed to instruct him? Every convert whose faith is to last and save him must have a certain amount of *knowledge* and also a certain amount of *habit in the exercise of that knowledge*. The instruction must, then, take into account the previous knowledge, whether true or false, of a candidate. It it a good thing before beginning the teaching of the Catholic doctrine, to draw from the convert, in a preparatory conversation, what he knows and thinks about religious matters in general. It will aid in treating certain

prejudices which creep into the judgment of most people entirely without their fault, with that gentleness which a physician or a nurse uses in examining the wounds of a person, and applying the remedies.

In instructing the young, or those who cannot read, or, in general, people of slow comprehension and with no settled habits of mind, an experienced catechist says he believes it best to begin by showing to the neophyte our absolute dependence on God. This leads at once to the practical necessity of prayer and to that humility of disposition which is the groundwork upon which we may safely build the sacred truths and incomprehensible mysteries of faith, which follow one after another in the course of instruction. The necessity of prayer is illustrated and enforced by teaching the "Our Father" and other short prayers—especially ejaculatory prayers, which by their easy and frequent repetition not only fix certain dogmas of faith upon the mind, but awaken a sense of God's continual presence, together with dispositions of confidence in Him. For the rest, the doctrines taught must be definite and thoroughly apprehended as facts. A very small catechism serves this purpose best in the beginning, even with those who are intelligent and apparently familiar with the general ground of Catholic belief. The importance of a careful and thorough training in the truths which are necessary *necessitate præcepti*, in the commandments of God and of the Church, and in the sacraments, cannot be over-estimated, if we wish to assure our convert's remaining a Catholic. A literal knowledge of the text of the catechism is certainly not essential, yet a clear and unequivocal definition of each truth cannot be dispensed with. All the supposed interior lights and devout feelings are—so far as they prevent a humble docility in matters of Catholic doctrine and practice—to be gently but firmly ignored. If knowledge without devotion is barren of fruit, devotion which is not grounded on clear knowledge of dogma is simply feeling and variable, besides being grossly delusive.

As to the precise order to be followed in building up the system of Catholic truth before the convert's mind, it will greatly depend on his general mental make up. The articles of the Apostles' Creed, the commandments, the sacraments and prayer, are the common method. Sometimes, however, it will be better to invert the order. There are, for example, persons who, though willing to belong to the true faith, are so devoid of memory, and of so indolent a disposition of mind, that the facts of faith make no impression upon them. Others are impatient of any serious and sustained thought. One has to teach them by actually amusing them, by taking possession of their foibles, predilections and aims, and to secure their attention and remembrance of things by appealing to the imagination. The first of these two classes is more easily managed than the other, because there is generally a spirit of reverence, which inferior minds pay by a sort of natural law to superiors; hence they will listen. By simile, story, appeal to the analogies of nature around them, or illustration drawn from their daily life, occupation, or trade, they can be taught the existence of God, His manner of dealing with us, the necessity of obedience to His laws, the use of the sacraments in sustaining the life of the soul, as air, food, exercise, cleanliness, etc., sustain our bodily life. But the young people; the trifling, fidgety, and spoiled children of our busy world, whose parents or guardians neglected nothing but to give them a knowledge of God, when some chance, *apparently*, but *really* saving grace, brings them in our way, these are a trying class of pupils. Short and frequent instructions, always interspersed and ended with something which will leave a pleasant recollection in them, is perhaps the only way to succceed in giving them a complete knowledge of the Catholic faith. I remember a priest who succeeded in instructing a somewhat flighty boy, who at the time had an ambition of going to West Point, but did not care to study the catechism, and whom parental authority did not or could not control in that direction. The youth was drilled in the doctrines and practices of the Church

just as if he were to be drilled for the army. God was the Major General, who had His executives, generals, majors, captains, and lieutenants. These, of course, had to be respected and obeyed. Then the entire economy of the army in peace and war was demonstrated by anology as existing in the Church. The youth always listened with curious attention, and it seemed to him quite reasonable that he should belong to this grand army, assert his convictions, as he called his faith, remain true to his baptismal vow, as to the flag of his regiment, be loyal to his captain, from whom he would never have any secrets, and, if he had committed a fault, would certainly acknowledge it, and meant never to capitulate to the enemy. So there are many other ways. Probably personal kindness will control the heart and mind and command the ear of those who are otherwise self-willed and without human respect.

IV.

But the best mind among converts needs more than a perfect knowledge of our holy faith, no matter how willing he be at the time to put it to use. We are creatures of habit, and knowledge is not the sole guide which forms it. There are two kinds of habit which a convert needs after he has apprehended the truths of faith. The habit of mind by which, as it were, he digests, takes up into his system, and assimilates the doctrines of the Church, and the habit of outward practice, which not only strengthens conviction, but prevents it from turning into a purely emotional service of self-love. Hence the catechetical instruction must be enlivened by what might be called the interpretation of its uses in the different approved devotions of the Catholic Church, and these devotions must in turn be practised, so as to produce graces in the heart of the convert. Many converts, though perfectly versed in the teaching of the Catholic Church and unquestionably sincere, can never be at home in Catholic society. Somehow or other, no matter how naturally self-

possessed, they feel awkward when there is any demonstration of the faith which they themselves cherish, and would not yield for life itself. They cannot enter into the spirit of it. This comes, I believe, from the defect of practice at the beginning, when they were instructed. The barrier of human respect was by some oversight left untouched, and the building was reared over it, leaving a stumbling block within, where it appears and cannot be removed. It is quite easy in speaking, for instance, of the providence of God, to illustrate it by the supplementary doctrine of the Church concerning guardian angels, and to point out some practical devotion in that direction; or, in explaining the mystery of the incarnation, to call attention to the devotions of the Sacred Heart, the Sacred Passion, the many beautiful exercises in honor of the Virgin Mother. To speak of these devotions is to suggest their practice; and to practise them with the convert or lead him directly to it, is to engender a familiar feeling of home in the bosom of holy Church. Each emblem of these devotions, carried constantly about, teaches virtue, protects from sin, and increases grace, and the convert enters naturally into the spirit of the different seasons of the eccleasiastical year. The instruction begins fitly with prayer, a prayer which betokens consciousness of God's presence, and thus quietly proves to the convert in the shortest possible way what no amount of catechism can supply, the reality of the things he is being taught. If he is capable of appreciating the great mystery of the altar, it will be well soon to instruct him in its meaning, and to assist upon punctual attendance at it, and great reverence during it. The so-called missals for the laity which contain literal translations of the S. Canon are not only no practical method for hearing Mass, but are prohibited as against the spirit of the Church,[1] who prudently wishes to

[1] Ex decr. S. R. C. a SS. Pio IX approbata 6 Jun. 1857. "Non licere Ordinarium Missæ et alios ss. rituum ordines in linguam vernaculam traducere et sic traductum ad usum fidelium typis mandare, item approbationem ejusmodi operis non posse ab Episcopo concedi."

guard something of the ancient *arcanum* in this most sacred of her mysteries. The literal translation into the vernacular is, in fact, *never* a translation, because the Latin words convey so much more meaning to those for whom they are intended, and who have been trained in this language of sacred theology, than their bare dictionary version can ever express. What the Church wishes is that the parts of the Mass be *explained* to the faithful. There are other devotions into which we may easily lead our convert by taking him to the altar of the Blessed Sacrament, the shrines of our Blessed Lady, or some patron-saint, and after having recited some prayers here, prescribe similar visits at stated intervals, when it shall be no longer necessary or possible for us to lead him personally.

The instruction for First Holy Communion should ordinarily *precede* the administration of Baptism, so that there remain nothing afterwards but the *practical preparation* for holy Communion, perhaps by a sort of retreat, as the circumstances allow. It is is rarely advisable to give all the sacraments at once, partly because it detracts from the reverent and special attention and preparation due to each of these inestimable founts of graces, partly because it deprives the convert of an opportunity to exercise the habit of devotion to which we referred above. The ceremonies of Baptism should be explained before the sacrament is conferred. When conditional Baptism is given (as is generally necessary with converts from Protestant sects), many deem it advisable that confession should be made before the Baptism, since the convert is thus better disposed. In this case he will return immediately after Baptism to the confessor and after a summary repetition of the previous confession receive conditional absolution.[1] Others think it preferable to follow out the order laid down by the S. C. S. Off. (20 Jul. 1859), which is: 1.

[1] Poterunt prius audiri sacramentaliter quoad eorum culparum accusationem, deinde post collationem Baptismatis sub conditione, confessarius iterum reassumptis per summa capita, cum pœnitente, iis de quibus jam accusationem fecerit, absolvatur sacramentaliter, pariter sub conditione.—

Abjuratio seu fidei professio. 2. *Baptismus conditionalis.* 3. *Confessio sacramentalis cum absolutione conditionata.* The *Abjuratio* is, of course, followed by the *Absolutio* (*conditionata*) *a censuris.*

Whilst the thorough instruction of converts is evidently no light task, it takes a proportionate amount of time. An experienced pastor, writing on this subject, says that to secure lasting effects from the preparation of converts requires under ordinary circumstances between ten and thirteen weeks, supposing that the instructions are given regularly three times in the week. No confidence is to be placed upon what the convert may do after having received Baptism or first Holy Communion. Experience proves daily that a great proportion of converts who are received with insufficient preparatory instruction, as frequently happens during the enthusiasm created by a mission, soon fall away from the faith they seemed to have found. If, on the other hand, the labor expended upon the conversion of a single soul is often equivalent to that required for the instruction of an entire flock, we have the assurance of the Good Shepherd by excellence that it is no less meritorious in the eyes of Him, "who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (I. Tim. ii. 4), who would have us leave the ninety-nine that are securely gathered in the fold, to seek the one stray lamb lost in the briars and thorns of this world.

SOCII SINGULARES ET FILII TEMPERANTIÆ.

I.

OUR article on Secret Societies[1] has elicited a number of inquiries in regard to the "Socii Singulares" and the Filii Temperantiæ," both of which are expressly mentioned in the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and which have been considered by some as nominally included in the censure which condemns the Freemasons, Carbonari, and Fenians.

[1] Am. Eccl. Review, April, pag. 125.

Before saying anything on this subject, which it was neither our purpose, nor, properly speaking, our province to touch in the article referred to, we would warn the reader that in treating of it now and here it is not our intention to forestall future judgments by the only competent Body which can rightfully pass a decision in the matter,[1] nor to point out a criterion according to which such a decision may be formed. Our object is merely to satisfy the bona fide inquirer, and to guard against misconceptions of facts which are within the reach of all, and upon which each might legitimately form a judgment under present circumstances. Hence, also, the opinions here offered can in no wise be understood as interfering with the positive and particular legislation in any one diocese or other.

Are the above-mentioned societies *nominally condemned*, in the sense in which the Holy See has condemned the Freemasons, Carbonari, Fenians, and kindred societies? We believe not, and until we hear the result of the examination made by the Committee already referred to, we can simply rank them as societies forbidden on general principles, but not under the public censure of the Church.

Before the publication of the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis," it was commonly assumed that the "Socii Singulares" (Odd Fellows), and "Filii Temperantiæ" (Sons of Temperance), were nominally under ecclesiastical censure. Theologians said so, although the Council of Baltimore [2] spoke, it seems to us, in terms sufficiently guarded not to force that inference. Judgment in the matter rested upon an answer of the Congregation of the S. Office to Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia. The latter had addressed a letter, dated February 26th, 1848, to the Prefect of the Propaganda, in which he asked whether the Constitution of Leo XII. embraced

[1] The Committee of Archbishops appointed for the purpose by the last Plenary Council of Baltimore, and who have, as is well understood, this subject at present under consideration.

[2] Conc. Pl. Balt., II., tit. xii., 5; ii., 514.

certain secret societies about whom there was a diversity of opinion among the Bishops here. In the first part of the letter he mentions the above-named societies, and concludes thus:[1] "I should wish to know, whether those societies which, although they enter into a secret union, binding themselves by oath, nevertheless profess that they do or meditate nothing against religion or the civil government, are to be considered *forbidden.*" No answer having arrived to this letter within three months after its date, and Bishop Kenrick regarding the matter as urgent, wrote a second note to the Prefect of the Propaganda. "In a previous letter," he says, "I made inquiry whether Secret Societies whose members are bound by oath or solemn promise, but which are not nominally condemned by the Holy See, are to be *considered forbidden, by reason of the fact that they profess themselves as secret*, whilst they deny that their object is contrary to the state or to religion."[2] Two years later the Congregation of the S. Office sent the following reply, (dated Feria VI die 21 Aug. 1850): "Comprehenduntur in Bullis Pontificiis."

Now, the Constitution of Leo XII is of a very wide range, embracing, as it does, the Bulls of his predecessors, Clement XII, Benedict XIV, Pius VII, which, he laments, were never fully carried out. It condemns nominally the Freemasons and Carbonari, and all other societies aiming, under whatever name, at subverting religious and civil society,[3] and he warns against those societies which, though they protest that they do not plot or act against Church or State, yet observe an absolute secret, under which they could hide these objects in

[1] "Vellem idcirco instrui, utrum cœtus illi pro vetitis habendi sint, qui profitentur, se nihil adversus religionem moliri, vel civilem rempublicam, licet occultum ineant fœdus juramento firmatum, vel alias se obligent ad arcanum." (Conc. Plen. Balt., II., Append. XV.)

[2] "De Societatibus Secretis, quæ juramento vel sponsione obstringuntur, et a S. Sede nominatim non sunt damnatæ, prioribus litteris judicium exquisivi, utrum illicitæ censendæ sint, eo ipso quod arcanum se habere profiteantur, negantes simul se adversus rempublicam vel religionem quidquid moliri." (Ibid., pag. 301.)

[3] Bullarium Rom. tom. XVI., Leo XII, C. III., § ii., ed. Rom. 1854.

spite of their profession.[1] What Bishop Kenrick had plainly asked was: Were these societies, which kept their transactions secret, to be considered *as forbidden?* The S. Congregation answers that they are comprehended in the Bulls. If the question was intended to include any more, it does not clearly appear unless further authoritative explanation made it so. If the answer was somewhat vague, it suited the nature of the question. In 1846 the same Congregation had written to the American Bishops: "Societates occultæ de quibus in Pontificiis Constitutionibus sermo est, eæ omnes intelliguntur, quæ adversus Ecclesiam vel Gubernium sibi aliquid proponunt; exigant vel non exigant a suis asseclis juramentum de secreto servando." (Decr. Feria IV. 5 Aug. 1846.) That the Congregation of the S. Inqu. was reluctant to condemn nominally any of the societies mentioned, so long as there were many others like them in everything except the name, would suggest itself from the fact that it did not answer the first letter; further, that the answer to the second note, (which, though it mentioned no society by name, still made reference to the former letter), was not given until two years had elapsed, in spite of the urgency which Bishop Kenrick represented to the Cardinal Prefect.[2] For even if we allow for the proverbial prudence which lies in delay, and for the fact that the state of things at Rome was greatly disturbed during these two years, the answer, when it did come, was much less explicit than in other similar cases, such as, for example, that of the "Fenians," even before their more express condemnation in 1870.[3] The letter of Cardinal Fransoni, which accompanies said answer of the Congr. S. Inqu., speaks of "nonnullas societates" without mentioning any name, and lays stress on the reason which induces Rome to condemn these societies, namely, because they are *secret*, which of course means *absolute* secrecy. Whereas, in the case of the societies which

[1] Bullarium Rom. tom. XVI., Leo XII, C. III., § xviii., ed. Rom. 1854.

[2] Vide Conc. Pl. Balt., II., pag. 301.

[3] Decr. S. R. Inqu. circa occultas sectas, 13 Jul., 1865. Acta S. Sedis, Vol. I., p. 290.

she meant doubtlessly to excommunicate, such as the Freemasons, she adds *exigant vel non exigant juramentum de secreto servando*, meaning that the essential quality which induces excommunication is not secrecy, but the fact that they militate against Church and State, "neque juramentum quod in hujusmodi sectis exigi solet de secreto servando, est quid essentiale, ut eæ damnatæ dicantur."[1] Thus it would appear that, as the matter stood, it was not clear enough not to remain doubtful to many.

II.

On 12th October 1869, Pius IX. issued his Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis," the object of which was to *limit* the censures called "latæ sententiæ," which were reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff. In it the following sentence refers to the Secret Societies: "Nomen dantes sectæ *Masonicæ*, aut *Carbonariæ* aut illis ejusdem generis sectis, quæ contra ecclesiam vel legitimas potestates seu palam seu clandestine machinantur." By the last clause the doubt whether secret societies which did not conspire against Church or State came under sentence of nominal excommunication seemed to be removed. Nevertheless, some theologians, even at Rome, maintained the old position, perhaps on the general ground that societies which exact from their members absolute secrecy and blind obedience to unknown superiors established thereby a strong presumption that they were plotting against religious or civil authority, which presumption was in their mind equivalent to proof of the fact.[2] As regards the society of Fenians, the Congregation having been asked, left no doubt of their explicit condemnation, which was published two months after the above mentioned Constitution: "Cum dubitatum fuerit a nonnullis, an societas Fenianorum comprehensa censeatur inter societates damnatas in Pontificiis Constitutionibus SS. Dom. N. Pius Div. Prov. Papa IX, exquisito, etc. . . decrevit atque de-

[1] Ibid., pag. 292, IV.

[2] This, we are told, explains the position of the late Fr. Konings in the matter.

claravit societatem Americanam seu Hibernicam, Fenianorum appellatam, comprehendi inter societates vetitas ac damnatas in Constitutionibus summorum Pontificum, et præsertim in nuperrima ejusdem Sanctitatis Suæ edita quarto Idus Octobris 1869, incip. 'Apostolicæ Sedis' qua sub num. 4, excommunicationi latæ sententiæ Romano Pontifici reservatæ obnoxii declarantur 'Nomen dantes sectæ Massonicæ aut Carbonariæ, aut aliis ejusdem generis sectis, quæ contra Ecclesiam vel legitimas potestates seu palam seu clandestine machinantur, nec non iisdem sectis favorem qualemcumque præstantes; earumve occultos coryphæos ac duces non denunciantes, donec non denunciaverint.'"

III.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, treating of secret Societies, reviews the acts of the Holy See on the subject. It does not mention the two societies placed at the head of our article. In the Appendix we find an Instruction of the S. R. et U. Inqu., regarding the Masonic orders, dated May 10, 1884. Section 3 reads thus: "Ne quis vero errori locus fiat, cum dijudicandum erit, quænam ex his perniciosis sectis censuræ, quæ vero prohibitioni tantum obnoxiæ sint, certum imprimis est, excommunicatione latæ sententiæ multari Massonicam aliasque ejus generis sectas, quæ c. 2, n. iv., Pontificiæ Constitutionis "Apostolicæ Sedis" designantur *quæque contra Ecclesiam vel legitimas potestates machinantur, sive id clam sive palam fecerint, sive exegerint, sive non, a suis asseclis secreti servandi juramentum.*[2]

Until we know therefore (from information obtained by those who are charged with investigation of the matter) whether the said societies militate against Church or State they cannot be treated by the individual as publicly excom-

[1] Decret. Feria IV. die 12 Januarii, 1870. The clause "earumve occultos coryphæos ac duces non denunciantes, etc.," applies to societies which plot against Church or State, and is not of strict interpretation in this country, although under circumstances it may become a duty.

[2] Conc. Pl. Balt. III., Append., p. 283. The emphasis is ours.

municated. They are always forbidden to Catholics, as we said before, because secrecy itself is a danger. An experienced and observant missionary priest tells us that he never knew a good Catholic belonging to any of these societies. For the rest, we cannot venture to anticipate the judgment of the Church hereafter, when she may find it expedient and necessary to pronounce public censure upon any of the above mentioned societies and perhaps others equally hurtful to the common good in Church or State.

CASUS MORALIS.

PATER Ambrosius nunquam potuit obtinere a parentibus Caroli veniam ipsum baptizandi. Parentes protestantes sunt, et Carolus, etsi jam attigerit annum vigesimum, nullum adhuc dedit signum rationis: imo tanta laborat mentis hebetudine ut ex peritorum judicio nullam omnino spem faciat de futura ejus cessatione. Quare bonus pastor solet super eo amare lugere.—Amarius adhuc luget cum videt maximam partem infantium, *diphtheria* in eo loco gravissime sæviente, quotidie mori absque baptismo. Verum Pater Augustinus, ipsius Vicarius, existimat infantes omnes viciniæ licite posse baptizari, eosque, capta occasione, de facto baptizat, tum quia imminet iis periculum mortis, tum quia plurimi ex ipsorum parentibus non sunt infideles sed hæretici.

Unde quæritur:

I. Utrum quod de filiis infidelium non adhuc habentibus usum rationis dicitur, scilicet eos, extra casum mortis, non posse licite baptizari, invitis parentibus, applicari debeat infantibus filiis hæreticorum?

II. Utrum, extra casum mortis, liceat baptizare quorumcumque parentum filios adultos qui non solum nunquam habuerunt usum rationis, sed etiam, ex peritorum judicio, illum nunquam sunt habituri?

III. Quomodo intelligendum sit periculum mortis, quo instante, licet baptizare filios infantes, parentibus invitis?

IV. Quid practice dicendum de Patre Ambrosio, quid de Patre Augustino?

I. Primæ quæstioni *affirmative* absque ullo dubio responderi debet, si parentes hæretici ita supponantur vivere et constituti ut Ecclesia non possit de facto jus suum apud eos prosequi. Hac enim facta hypothesi, moraliter certum est filios hæreticorum, catholice baptizatos, exponi periculo perversionis, et consequenter sacramentum obnoxium fieri profanationi.—Quod Ecclesia jus habeat compellendi hæreticos ut filiis suis præbeant necessaria media salutis, ac proinde ut non solum ipsis validum baptismum procurent, sed etiam ut sinant consentaneam dari educationem, res certa est et ab omnibus theologis admissa. Sed quæstio præsens, quæ tota quanta est respicit factum, non solvitur ex admissione istius juris, sed ex eo solum:—num scilicet jus istud possit actuari. Quare Suarezius, *de Baptismo*, disp. 25, Sect. 5, sapienter ait: "Parum refert ad periculum tollendum jus, quod Ecclesia habet, si non est potens ad illud exequendum." Quoniam autem certum est, apud nos, Ecclesiam nullo modo posse præpedire quominus infans aliquis, rite baptizatus a sacerdote catholico, detineatur, sive physice sive moraliter, a parentibus hæreticis, et consequenter imbuatur iisdem erroribus quos parentes profitentur aut forte pejoribus; sequitur ipsam non posse permittere ut filii hæreticorum, in hac regione degentium, licite baptizentur, parentibus invitis.—Hæc conclusio majorem vim accipit, si præterea consideretur multos ex iis parentibus quos vocamus *hæreticos* aut *protestantes* non esse valide baptizatos, ac proinde sæpe deficere fundamentum juris vi cujus Ecclesia posset eos obligare.

Sed ut ulterius adhuc procedat vis argumenti, supponamus modo parentes esse certe baptizatos, quamvis hæreticos: supponamus etiam ipsos non esse invitos, imo expresse velle ut eorum filii baptizentur a sacerdote catholico; si tamen nulla

habeatur spes catholicæ futuræ educationis, tum etiam abstinendum est a baptismo conferendo. Spem hanc in plerisque casibus adesse ultro fateor, et quasi dicerem tunc tantum deesse cum parentes hæretici, petito ministerio sacerdotali, renuunt ullam promissionem facere in favorem catholicæ educationis, et aperte testantur filios instrui debere juxta principia suæ sectæ. Verum, hac facta hypothesi, dicendum omnino est non licere hujusmodi pueros baptizare, nam tunc moraliter certum est eos, prouti C. S. O. in Instr. data 21 Jan., 1767, habet, "fidem catholicam, quam per sponsores in Baptismo profiteri debent, sacrilege ejuraturos, ad majorem sui condemnationem et catholicæ Ecclesiæ in qua regenerati sunt graviorem contemptum."— Præter rationem nuper datam, conclusio tenenda est etiam quia inculcatur missionariis a S. C. de P. F. in Instr. data 17 Apr., 1777; quia conformis est praxi quam optimi operarii in hac parte vineæ Domini sequuntur; quia innuitur a Conc. Plen. Balt. II., n. 229; quia traditur in multis responsis Romanarum Congregationum. Ex istis juvat unum referre ex *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Vol. XVII., pag. 605.—Dubium ab Episcopo Mantuano in linguam latinam versum ita efferebatur: "Si duo conjuges protestantes, deficiente ministro propriæ sectæ, offerant parocho vel cuicumque alteri sacerdoti catholico proprium filiolum baptizandum, et simul declarent non esse eorum intentionem se per talem oblationem obligatos fieri ad eum catholice educandum, num poterit parochus illum baptizare, ut ante omnia certam ei faciat æternam salutem, nihil cogitans de eo quod accidere potest cum puer ad maturam ætatem pervenerit?"—Porro huic dubio Emsmi Inq. Generales die 26 Aug. 1885, responderunt: "Negative præterquam in periculo mortis."—Hanc vero responsionem Summus Pontifex eadem die approbavit.

Objici hic potest, contra expositam solutionem, tum ex rationibus quas S. Alphonsus et alii theologi afferunt in contrarium, tum ex ipsorum auctoritate. Etenim S. Doctor *de Baptismo*, n. 127, quærens quid sit agendum in casu quo "proles sit mansura apud parentes hæreticos," et relata sententia

eorum qui negant posse tum conferri baptismum propter periculum perversionis, ita prosequitur: "Probabilius affirmant (posse licite baptizari) Layman . . . , Croix. . . . cum Aversa . . . , et probabile putat Palaus . . . —Ratio, tum quia non est certa perversio talis prolis, cum plures pueri in infantia decedant; tum quia idem periculum urget, si proles non baptizatur; baptizatur enim ab hæreticis, a quibus verum quidem baptisma confertur."—Sed patet primam rationem hic datam, scilicet non adesse periculum, quia plures pueri moriuntur ante adeptum usum rationis, nimium probare; nam æquo jure possent tunc baptizari filii infidelium, quod ipse S. Alphonsus illicitum esse testatur. Ad alteram autem rationem, omissis multis quæ possent adnotari, respondetur breviter: non licere periculum sacrilegii inducere ex hac sola ratione, quia secus alius illud induceret.—Aliæ rationes in contrarium ita congeruntur a Claudio La Croix, Lib. VI., part. i., n. 307: "Quia multum confert ad conversionem ejusmodi puerorum si postea audiant se catholice baptizatos esse."—Sed respondetur contrarium verosimilius accidere apud nos, et loco conversionis puerorum jurgia et querelas moveri ex parte parentum, saltem in casu quo baptismus confertur, ipsis invitis.—Prosequitur Croix: "Quia hoc est tali proli aliunde utile, cui præter certam materiam et formam, adhibentur sacræ ceremoniæ et preces Ecclesiæ."—Sed respondetur utilitatem quæ provenit ex precibus et ceremoniis esse accidentalem, et non compensare periculum perversionis cui exponitur proles; præterea non esse procurandam contra mentem Ecclesiæ. Utilitas autem quæ provenit ex certitudine materiæ et formæ, maxima profecto est et substantialis, sed respondetur tunc jam non esse amplius quæstionem de hæreticis qui certo baptizant, quod supponitur in casu.—Aliam rationem ita addit Croix: "Quia hæresis apud multos est tantum materialis." Hoc idem, quod videtur habere majus pondus, ita urgetur a Layman, *de Baptismo*, Lib. V., Tract. II., Cap. vi., n. 12:—"Addi etiam potest, tametsi a parentibus, et ministris suis hæreticis falsa dogmata edoceantur, (filii hæreticorum catholice baptizati)

interdum ignorantia difficulter vincibili laborare, et pertinaces hæreticos non esse ; ut proinde tales donum Fidei baptismatis retineant, et salvari possint, si de peccatis post baptismum commissis vera contritione doleant."—Sed respondetur tales pueros postea æque salvari absque tali baptismo, si supponatur in eis contritio perfecta : si vero hæc non supponatur, baptismus nihil eis proderit ad salutem æternam acquirendam.

Ad difficultatem autem quæ desumitur ex auctoritate tantorum theologorum, breviter respondetur verbis citatæ Instr. S. C. de P. F., "Doctorum opiniones ad Ecclesiæ decreta sunt exigendæ, non ipsa decreta ad opinantium libitum, inflectenda."—Forte etiam dici potest Layman motum fuisse a praxi baptizandi hujusmodi pueros quam ipse testatur sæpius observari in Germania "a viris doctis ac piis." Forte etiam hæc praxis causa fuit cur P. Lehmkuhl hac in re benignius loqueretur, nam non videtur contentus ordinario periculo perversionis, sed vult ut hoc sit "magnum," vel "extraordinarium," aut "singulare."—

II. Ex dictis jam patet perpetuo amentes posse licite baptizari absque consensu parentum, sive hi sint hæretici, sive infideles. Ratio est quia abest ab illis periculum perversionis et aliunde patria potestas non sese extendit ad illos sicut ad pueros in tenera ætate. Attamen magna requiritur prudentia, si parentes sunt inviti, ne scilicet excitetur odium in veram religionem, et nullus sit locus jurgiis et querelis ex parte acatholicorum. Hinc Instr. sæpe citata S. C. de P. F. ait : "Communis est Doctorum sententia, duce S. Thoma (3. p. q. 68. art. 12,) amentes a nativitate, in quibus nec præsens apparet, nec futurus speratur usus rationis, inter infantes computari, et quoad susceptionem baptismi eodem casu esse per totam vitam atque pueri qui versantur in proximo periculo mortis : sicut enim isti pueri, qui nondum rationis usum attigerunt, consulere sibi non valent ; sic nec illi amentes ullo vitæ tempore providere sibi possunt, quia, utpote perpetuo amentes, nunquam rationis usum attingunt : quatenus ergo vere probabili ac prudenti judicio censeatur illa rationis impotentia, licite

baptizari possunt. Neque enim quoad hujusmodi amentes locum habet ea ratio, quæ generatim obstat, ne licite baptizentur filii infidelium invitis parentibus, quod nimirum præcavendæ perversionis causa non sine parentum offensione essent ab eorum cura et potestate abstrahendi: non, inquam, valet hæc ratio quoad perpetuo amentes, quos a perversionis periculo subtrahit perpetua ipsorum amentia, tutoque ideo possunt in cura et potestate parentum relinqui. Caute tamen et prudenter in illis aut inquirendis aut baptizandis gerere se sacros ministros oportebit, ne in Christianam religionem infidelium odium, et sævitia in fideles concitetur.

III. Tertia quæstio facile solvitur, dicendo periculum quod requiritur ad licite baptizandos filios infidelium aut hæreticorum debere esse non apprehensum tantum et imaginarium, sed reale; non vagum et indeterminatum, afficiens omnes pueros in genere, sed particulare; non futurum aut prævisum, sed actuale. Ratio est quia secus non evitarentur omnia illa incommoda quæ hac in re necessario evitanda sunt. Ad hujus doctrinæ confirmationem iterum citanda est prædicta Instructio S. C. de P. F., ubi hæc habentur:—"Repetenda hic sententia S. Thomæ de maxima parte auctoritatis, quæ inest in Ecclesiæ consuetudine, quæ semper in omnibus est æmulanda, et adversus quam periculosum est nova inducere. Non defuerunt primis Ecclesiæ sæculis, dum christiani cum infidelibus permixti degebant, vastitates et pestilentiæ; nec propterea in more unquam positum fuit, ut Ecclesiæ SSmi Pastores pueros infidelium, quibuscum vivebant, invitis vel insciis parentibus baptizarent. Degunt etiam nunc vel in alma Urbe, inter christianos Hebræi, suisque moribus vivere permittuntur; nec tamen Summi Pontifices unquam concessere, ut sive palam sive occulte infantes Hebræorum filii, invitis aut insciis parentibus, baptizarentur ob eam causam, quod sæviente populari lue multo plures ex illis infantibus intereunt. Ex quo facile intelligitur, duplicem, quod ad præsens institutum pertinet periculi rationem distingui oportere, videlicet: periculum illud commune et vagans, quod sanis etiam hominibus in iis locis

impendet, quæ populari morbo affliguntur ; alterum proprium ac certum, in quo sunt quos mali tabes inficit, aut qui quocumque modo in præsens vitæ discrimen adducuntur. Pontificum porro Constitutiones, et Congregationum decreta, dum filios infidelium, invitis parentibus, baptizari vetant præterquam in mortis periculo, loquuntur de isto præsenti periculo, quod hominem baptizandum determinate attingit, quod que interdum velut per synonymam vocem nomine articuli mortis exprimitur, non autem loquuntur de illo communi et vaganti periculo, in quod nec vocabulum nec notio articuli mortis ullo modo convenit."

IV. Ad ultimam quæstionem propositam dicendum est Patrem Ambrosium peccasse ex timiditate, et Patrem Augustinum ex imprudentia et audaciori quadam ratione agendi. Desinat igitur Pater Ambrosius lugere super Carolo : ipsum quamprimum rite baptizet, sed ita ut ejus parentes non offendantur. Quoniam autem certo offenderentur, si, postquam veniam sæpe recusaverint, scirent Carolum fuisse baptizatum, Pater Ambrosius clanculum ei conferat baptismum, et, si timeat ne ipse Carolus, in sua stupiditate, rem totam narret parentibus, poterit sacramentum ministrare dum eum videt dormientem.—Pater Augustinus autem theologice errat cum existimat infantes omnes viciniæ licite posse baptizari ; nam ex dictis constat duas rationes quibus innititur non esse efficaces. Zelo imbuitur, sed non prudentia ; et ipsius ratio agendi facile poterit querelas et discordias excitare apud suos concives acatholicos.

Cf. S. Thom. 3. p. q. 68. art. 12.—S. Alphons. *de Baptismo*, n. 127.—Bened. XIV. *Const. Probe te*, 15 Dec. 1751, et *Const. Postremo mense* 28 Feb. 1747.—Conc. Plen. Balt. II. n. 229.—Suarez. disp. XXV. Sect. V.—Bucceroni, *Enchiridion*, N. 248.—Layman, Lib. V., Tract. II., Cap. VI., n. 12.—Salmant. Tract. II., Cap. VI., Punct. II., n. 16.—Croix, Lib. VI., Part. I., n. 307.—Lehmkuhl, Vol. 2, n. 84 et seqq.—Kenrick, Tract. XV., n. 28 et seqq.—Nouvelle Revue Théologique, Vol. XVII., pag. 601 et seqq. Konings, n. 1261.—Sabetti, n. 662, q. 2° at 3°.—

A. Sabetti, S. J.

CONFERENCE.

THE PASCHAL CANDLE.

THE Paschal Candle is lighted at the solemn services of Mass and Vespers on all Sundays and holydays of obligation. At the parochial Masses on Sundays, even if they be low Masses. At the solemn functions on Monday and Tuesday, Saturday in "Albis," and where customary on other solemn occasions, (et in aliis diebus et solemnitatibus etiam solemniter celebratis *non accenditur* nisi adsit consuetudo.—S. R. C. 351 ad 13).

It is not lighted whenever Mass is celebrated in *violet* or *black*. Not, when simply Benediction of the Most Bl. Sacrament is given.

On the feast of the Ascension it is extinguished by an Acolyte after the singing of the gospel. After the Mass it is removed, and used again on the Vigil of Pentecost for the blessing of the Baptismal Font.

NON OMITTENDA IN "MISSA CANTATA."

Qu. In a missa cantata (without deacon and subdeacon), when sung on other days than holydays of obligation,

a. Can the celebrant *sing* the *first*, and simply *read* the other Collects?

b. Can he *proceed* with the Mass while the choir is singing the *Gloria* or *Credo?*

c. Can the singing of the *Gloria* and *Credo*, under any circumstances, be altogether dispensed with?

RESP. *Ad a.* There is no warrant in the Decrees of the S. Congregations for the practice of omitting the singing of any of the Collects in a missa cantata. The General Rubrics of the Missal (Tit. XVI. 3) enumerate the "Orationes ante Epistolam," and "Orationes post Communionem," among the parts

to be sung in *Missa Solemnis.* Nor does the special Rubric for the Ritus Celebrandi Missam *si quandoque celebrans cantat missam sine Diacono et Subdiacono* (Tit. VI. 8) make any exception.

Ad b. To proceed with the Mass while the choir is singing the *Gloria* or *Credo* is against the Rubrics, which latter oblige him to *sing* the *Dominus vobiscum.*

Confer. Rubr. Generales Missæ, Tit. XVI. 3.
" Rit. Celebrandi Miss., Tit. VI. 8.
" De Herdt, Vol. I., iii., 2°.
" Wapelhorst, Compend. S. Liturg., n. 89. 3.

" Nec sacerdos interim prosequens submissa voce dicere potest " Dominus vobiscum " et " Oremus " ante Offertorium; hæc enim juxta Rubricas cantare debet."

For the same reason it is not permitted to continue the Mass immediately after the singing of the " Et incarnatus est." Non potest celebrans Missam prosequi statim ac a choro cantatus sit versiculus Symboli " Et incarnatus est."

(S. R. C. 16 Mar. 1861. Decr. auth., n. 5310 ad I.)

Ad c. The following Decree seems to forbid it.

Dub. XII. In tota fere Diœcesi Lucionensi adest consuetudo canendi Missas, quæ infra hebdomadam a diversis fidelibus petuntur, *omittendo in choro Gloria* et Graduale vel Tractum, nec non Sequentiam *vel Credo* si dicenda occurrant, ea ratione quod cantor unicus omnes Missæ cantus difficillime peragere posset, populusque diuturnitatem Missæ, præsertim in diebus servilibus, ægre sustineat. Quæritur *utrum prædictus modus canendi missas servari possit,* vel prout abusus eliminandus sit ejusmodi consuetudo?

Resp. *Ad dub.* Consuetudo, de qua in casu, veluti abusus prorsus eliminanda est.
(S. R. C. die 29 Decr., 1884. Decr. auth., 5929.)

Parts of the " Gloria " may be supplied by the organ: " Ubicumque autem organum adhibetur, initium et finis, et ea quæ inclinationem et genuflexionem exigunt, semper cantanda sunt." But the " Credo " must always be sung entirely and distinctly. Cum dicitur Symbolum in missa non est alternandum cum organo, sed illud integrum per chorum cantu intelligibili proferatur. (Crem. Episc., XXVIII., 10.)

SINGING OF THE "DIES IRÆ."

Qu. In missa solemni pro defunctis (sine diacono et subdiacono),

a. Must the *Dies iræ* be always sung by the choir, and that, too, from beginning to end?

b. Can the celebrant proceed with the Mass while the choir is singing the *Dies iræ?*

RESP. *Ad a.* To omit the singing of the *Dies iræ* would be against the Decrees of the S. R. C.

"Vel non celebrandas missas defunctorum vel *canenda esse omnia, quæ precationem suffragii respiciant.*" (S. R. C., 11 Sept., 1847.)

The S. Cong. having been asked for an explanation of the words precationem suffragii, answered:

"Verba illa "precatio Suffragii" includere Sequentiam, *Dies iræ*, et Offertorium." (S. R. C., 9 Maj., 1857).

But it need not be sung from beginning to end, as appears from the following Decree:

"Sequentiam *Dies iræ* semper dicendam in missis de Requie, quæ cum unica tantum oratione decantantur, verum *aliquas strophas illius cantores prætermittere posse.*" (S. R. C., 12 Aug., 1854).

Ad b. Is against the Rubrics, which require the singing of the "Dominus vobiscum," which would be omitted in the supposed case. (Cfr. quod supra dict. de "Gloria" et "Credo").

KEROSINE FOR SANCTUARY LAMP.

Qu. Can a priest use kerosine-oil in the lamp before the Blessed Sacrament without sin, *sciente et non contradicente episcopo?* Moreover, a confrère tells me that pure Olive Oil would not burn in a church in our climate, if no fire be kept in winter.

Resp. It would be safer to ask the Bishop than ask the "Review." Fr. Wapelhorst, in his excellent compendium S.

Liturgiæ, cites the S. R. C. 16 Sept. 1881: "Usus *Kerosine* in casu necessitatis permitti potest *juxta prudens episcopi arbitrium* (Leavenworthen). Though we could not find the decree under that date in Gardellini's Decreta authentica, there must be some foundation for it. The late Bishop Baltes (Past. Instr. Apr. 12, 1875, n. 43) says: By a decision, approved by His Holiness Pius IX., of July 14th, 1864, the Bishops may allow the use of *Petroleum.*—Sec. Scavini IV, n. 338 (which is probably a misprint for III, 685). "We therefore allow such, etc." But the decision evidently referred to does not say so much. It reads: "Generatim utendum esse oleo olivarum; *ubi vero haberi nequeat*, remittendum *prudentiæ Episcoporum*, ut lampades nutriantur ex aliis oleis, quantum fieri possit vegetabilibus. (S. R. C. die 9, Jul. 1864, confirm. die 14 Jul., 1864.)

Notice that other than olive oil is to be used only where the latter cannot be obtained, as St. Charles seems to have permitted to churches in the high mountain districts (Scavini, loc. cit. ed. Paris 1863) of his diocese; although he says: Lumen lampadum oleo olivæ nutrietur, *nec vero alterius generis adhibeatur*, nisi quibus locis Archiepiscopus *ob eam causam* concesserit, *quia nullum ejus generis haberi potest.* (Act. Mediol. p. 4 et alibi in XI. Syn. diœc.) There is also a Votum Consultoris, which was afterwards added to the decree just mentioned, and wherein the following conclusion is given: "Hinc in quæstione de qua agimus in *solo casu deficientiæ olei olivarum Episcoporum* prudentiæ remitti usum aliorum oleorum, quantum fieri potest vegetabilium, eorum nempe *quæ aliquo modo minus distent ab oleo olivarum.*" (Muhlb. Decr. auth. Suppl. II., page 433.)

As to whether it would burn in our climate remains a matter of experiment. It may require lighting more frequently than in a warm climate.

BOOK REVIEW.

MANUALS OF CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY. New York. Benziger Bros.

1. MORAL PHILOSOPHY; OR, ETHICS AND NATURAL LAW. By Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J., pp. viii. 376. 1888.
2. THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF KNOWLEDGE. By Rev. John Rickaby, S.J., pp. ix. 412. 1889.
3. LOGIC. By Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S.J., pp. xvi. 497. 1889.

We have arranged these volumes according to the order of their publication. The first was issued almost a year ago, the third is fresh from the press, having reached us too late for review in this number. We intend saying something here about the second—as to its subject matter, manner, and special utility.

First Principles of Knowledge—the sign indicates the wares to be found within —not toys and tinsel, but solid goods—things of first importance to every rational being, since they form the basis of all mental building. "Generalities" and "Particularities" of Certitude—these mark the main divisions of the stock in trade (p. 187). Under "Generalities" we find such articles as Truth (logical), Certitude (in various kinds and degrees), with its supreme criterion, Primary Facts and Principles, to equip a logician, Graphic Sketches of Scepticism in ruins, and the story of how error finds its way into the intellect. For "Particularities" we have proofs of the validity of our senses, Objectivity of Ideas, Consciousness, Memory, Testimony—human and divine. Let us stop to look at some of the "Generalities" (Ch. I.). What is Truth? The good old description: Adæquatio intellectus mei—is the dictum of common sense (p. 2), and so *a priori* we rightly look to some Philosophy for its support. But how can mind be like to matter? "How can mental images be like outer objects, especially material objects?" The query, a difficulty to every thinker, to the empiricist must needs be a riddle utterly unanswerable. Hence we are not surprised to hear that "the likeness is symbolic: just as a mathematical formula, though not like, may yet symbolize the path of a cannon ball" (p. 8); or, as Mr. H. Spencer puts it: "If x and y are the two uniformly connected properties in some outer object, while a and b are the effects which they produce in our consciousness, the sole need is that a and b, and the relation between them, shall always answer to x and y, and the relation between them. It matters not if a and b are both like x and y, or not;" nay,

"their total dissimilarity is no disadvantage." "Our scientific conceptions," says Mr. Frederick Harrison, "have a very good working correspondence with the assumed reality without;" but is the correspondence absolute? Nescimus. Such "correspondence" does not meet the demands of the old Logic. "Necesse est quod intellectus, in quantum est cognoscens, sit verus in quantum habet *similitudinem* rei cognitæ," says S. Thomas. (1. 16, 2, c). The "equation," however, between thought and thing need not be exhaustive (p. 4). Conformitas non debet esse adæquata, sufficit ut notæ quæ repræsentantur in intellectu sint revera in objecto (Van der Aa, Log., p. 35). The likeness, moreover, is "sui generis." For the cognitive act "is not a dead picture, but something effected by and in the living, cognitive mind; it is a thing with a conscious meaning of its own; it is, as Spinoza says, self-assertive, or self-referent. A signum *quo*, not *ex quo*" (p. 5). A conformitas *intentionalis*—in repræsentando, non in essendo. And herein lies the reason why truth can be found completely only in the judicial act wherein intellectus *dicit* esse quod est, et non esse quod non est (p. 17), and, implicitly at least, knows its own conformity with its object.

From the act of knowing regarded as representative, we pass to a property of the same act, following its relation to its subject, though, of course, conditioned both by object and subject—Certitude. "Certitude is the state of the mind when it firmly assents to something, because of motives which exclude at least all solid, reasonable misgivings" (p. 44). Does this perfect possession of truth admit of *degrees*? As to its negative side, exclusion of doubt, it certainly does not. Quod negativum est, indivisibile est. As to its positive element, firmness of assent, it undoubtedly does, such degrees being marked by varying conditions of object and subject. Does it also admit of *kinds* or *species*? "In the firmness of assent, if anywhere, specific differences of certitude are to be found; for differences here will be differences within the essential constituents," (p. 55). We prefer, however, in this matter, the statement of Fr. Van der Aa, though it runs counter to most of his co-laborers: "Dividitur quidem specifice certitudo objective [*i.e.* in causa seu motivis], spectata in metaphysicam, physicam, et moralem; at non ipsa certitudo *formaliter* spectata [*i.e.* in suo esse]." (Log. p. 46). The terms metaphysical, physical, and moral, when used to qualify the fixed *state* of the *mind*, point rather to degrees than to *kinds*.

After refuting the theories of Mr. Huxley on necessary truth (pp. 69–

83), Fr. Rickaby ably draws out the indirect argument for the existence of such truth : *a.* from the admission of adversaries as to moral truth. A striking assertion is that of Mr. Mill, wherein he declares that "rather than call any being good who is not good in the human meaning of the word, he would go down forever into hell" (p. 83). Surely, he could have recorded no stronger conviction "as to the absoluteness of moral truth, not only in this world, but in the next; not only in man, but in the Supreme Being" (p. 84). *b.* "But not only in the region of morals . . . but even in the region of cold, clear thought itself, adversaries are betrayed into admission of metaphysical principles strictly so called" (p. 85). Witness, for example, the statement of Mill: "Logic points out what relations *must* subsist between the data and *whatever can be* concluded from them: between the proof and *anything which it can prove.* If there be any such *indispensable* relations, and if these *can be precisely determined, every particular branch of science*, as well as *every individual* in the guidance of his conduct, is *bound* to conform to these relations under penalty of making false inferences, which are not *grounded on the reality of things*" (*ib*). Verily, the modern empiricist finds it no easier to get rid of "human nature" than did the ancient sceptic.

Highly important is ch. x. on "Primary Facts and Principles." It is to be regretted that most of our Latin manuals give little or no explicit treatment of this subject. Fr. Tongiorgi devotes an article to it, and Fr. Van der Aa, whose logic owes so much to Tongiorgi's, has wisely followed the latter at this point. Though allowing, with Mr. H. Spencer, "the almost illimitable blending of idea with idea in the texture of mind," for "the body of our knowledge is a sort of organism, the property of which is that the parts exist for the whole, and the whole for the parts," still, by abstractive reflection we are able to single out a few primary truths which "can be absent from no act of knowledge" (p. 169).

These are : *a.* the factum primum—the existence of the thinking subject implied in every cognitive act ; and here Descartes does good service with his *cogito, ergo sum, cogito* evidently containing the *fact sum ; b.* the conditio prima—our ability to know. Strict proof of this must ever be a petitio principii ; *c.* the principle of contradiction, regarded not simply from its logical but also from its ontological side : Idem non potest simul esse et non esse. "No statement that we could make would have any meaning if this principle had not clear objective validity" (p. 174). The author very appositely warns the reader that these primar-

ies are not to be taken in sensu exclusivo. "Other primaries are not denied, on the contrary, the principle of identity is primary; so is the pinciple of sufficient reason; so is the principle of evidence, etc." (p. 175), but "among primaries the three enumerated deserve special prominence to be given them because of their importance" (p. 174).

The description of evidence is excellent (ch. xiii.). The *a posteriori* argument, showing evidence to be the final criterion of certitude, based on induction from our individual faculties, is well drawn out. The question is so important, that we should like to have seen the *a priori* proof from the nature of the cognoscitive faculty and act, for evidence is not only *de facto*, but also *de jure*, the supreme norm of certitude.

We have lingered so long among the "Generalities" that we cannot dwell in the "Particularities." Specially important and strongly put are the arguments for the trustworthiness of our senses (pp. 267–289), for the objectivity of universal ideas (pp. 314–325), for the range and validity of consciousness (pp. 340–362).

When we pass from the subjects themselves to the manner in which the author handles them, we find no words of praise too strong. Master of the truths furnished by Catholic Philosophy, he uses them with consummate skill; not merely parading them in dress uniform, but sheathing them in burnished mail, he sends them forth, with lance in hand, to battle; for he aims from the start "to present scholasticism militant," "to make the truth manifest in conflict" (p. viii.). And against no handful of pigmies, nor spectres of the past does he send them, but against giants, many and living; against foes who wage war with might, and who aim at nothing short of demolishing the very foundations of all truth. But the conflict of error is never a constant one. In the thick of the fray we often see its champions turn their arms one against another and do valiant work in the cause of truth. Many a wound, moreover, is self-inflicted, for the contradictions of our modern free-lance philosophers are in number almost beyond belief.

Fr. Rickaby is withal a fair opponent. Whilst exposing the weak side of an adversary, he is just and ready to show his strength. Thus Thomas Reid, "the philosopher of common sense," is proved not to have been the cruel Hubert, seeking to put out the eyes of human intelligence, many a logician portrays him, but, though vacillating and not always consistent, yet in the main he attributes to the mind not so much blind assent, as "blindness to the mode of working in the faculty," puzzled by